UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,902	02/28/2007	Alain Ballagny	279101US6PCT	6280
	7590 10/22/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE ST	REET	MONDT, JOHANNES P		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3663		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/551,902	BALLAGNY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JOHANNES P. MONDT	3663	

	JOHANNES P. MONDT	3663	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeliance Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited eal (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 sension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origin than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>13 October 2010</u>. A brithe date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disn	nissal of the
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20,23,27,29,31,35,36 and 39.		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: <u>20,23,27,23,37,33,30 and 33.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21,24-26,32,37 ar</u> AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<u>nd 38</u> .		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
October 20, 2010.	/JOHANNES P MONDT Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments raise new issues through new claims 40-48. Furthermore, new matter appears to be introduced (e.g., the recited "blends of alloys" do not appear to have written support in the specification-as-filed. The proposed amendment s cannot be deemed to place the application in better form for appeal, at least because a substantial portion of the claim language has not been examined while some of the new issues constitute new matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant fails to address the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as set forth in section 5, and hence examiner is not persuaded of error. Applicant also fails to address why the terms "ductile" and "stainless" are not relative terms, terms of degree. A qualitative meaning can be given, as herewith admitted by applicant. However, the issue was not whether, within the context of the specification, "ductile" and "stainless" have no meaning, but instead whether they have adequate quantitative metes and bounds. Therefore, applicant's traverse to the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as set forth in section 6 does not persuade. Regarding the traverse of the rejections under 35 USC 103(a), traverse of the rejections over Hooper are not persuasive because 1a is cladding exterior to 1b which together with 2/3 forms an enclosure meeting the claimed casing. Counter to applicant's contention separate wires are clearly disclosed in Hooper (see the description of the convolutions of the fuel body of particles). Regarding the traverse of the rejections over Travelli, said traverse does not address the claim language, wherein separateness is not excluded, whereas "assembly" is to narrowly interpreted, in view of its ordinary meaning as a collection. Applicant is further reminded that at this time prosecution is closed. JPM..